

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

RICHARD ROY SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

V.

VAN HOOK,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05785-RBL-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RE-
NOTE

The District Court referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to United States Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. Plaintiff Richard Roy Scott, a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”), initiated this action on September 6, 2016. *See* Dkt. 1. Currently before the Court is a document filed by Plaintiff titled “Re-noting Mts DK#s 8 and 10” (“Motion”), wherein Plaintiff requests the Court re-note two motions which were previously denied by this Court. Dkt. 30.

Plaintiff requests the Court re-note the “Motion for Leave to Conduct Discovery of Defendant Hook Motion for TRO” (“Motion for Discovery”) and “Motion for Expert Funding and Special Master or Standby Lawyer” (“Motion for Special Master”) because the motions are now ripe for review. Dkt. 8, 10, 30. These two motions were ready for the Court’s consideration in October of 2016. *See* Dkt. 8, 10. On November 15, 2016, the Court denied the motions as

1 premature and in violation of Plaintiff's case management orders. Dkt. 18. The Court declines to
2 vacate its previous decision and revive the motions simply because Plaintiff asserts the motions
3 are ripe for review. Accordingly, the Motion is denied.¹ *See Whitney v. Edwards*, 1994 WL
4 478814, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 1994) (denying plaintiff's request to revive issues decided in
5 previous orders).

6 Dated this 22nd day of February, 2017.

7 
8 David W. Christel
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 ¹ The Court notes nothing in this order prevents Plaintiff from filing new motions regarding his requests for discovery and for a special master.